

REMARKS

Claims 1–3, 6–17 and 20–38 were previously pending. Claims 1, 6, 12, 14, 21–26, 28, 30, and 32 are amended. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7–11, 13, 15–20, 27, 29, 31, and 33–38 are canceled. No claims are added. Claims 1, 3, 6, 12, 14, 21–26, 28, 30, and 32 remain pending.

Applicants thank Examiner Colin M. LaRose for an interview conducted on July 23, 2007, with Applicants representative Pablo Tapia. During the interview the Examiner indicated that Claim 2, 8–11, 13 and 14 would be allowable based upon the previously presented claims in the December 4, 2006 response, if presented independent form. Furthermore, Examiner LaRose acknowledged that amending a “trainable classifier” with “support vector machine” is consistent with the allowability of claims indicated in the Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 8–11, 13 and 14 are indicated to be allowable if certain amendments are made. These and other claims are amended as indicated below and are now allowable over the prior art.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation previously included in claim 2, now canceled.

Claim 3 amends from claim 1 and is allowable by virtue of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitation previously included in claims 7 and 8, now canceled.

Claim 12 depends from claim 6, now allowable.

Claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of its base claim 6 prior to its current amendment.

Type of Response: Final Response
Application Number: 09/895,429
Attorney Docket Number: 163182.01
Filing Date: 6/28/2001

Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 6, now allowable. Therefore, Claim 21 is allowable by virtue of the allowability of claim 6.

Claims 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, and 32 ultimately depend from claim 21, and therefore are also allowable.

Claims 24 and 25 has been amended to depend from claim 1, now allowable. Therefore, Claims 24 and 25 are allowable by virtue of the allowability of claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 101 AND § 103 REJECTIONS

Particular claims were rejected under Section 101 and/or Section 103 of 35 U.S.C. The rejections are moot in light of the current amendments and cancellations.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Final Response
Application Number: 09/895,429
Attorney Docket Number: 163182.01
Filing Date: 6/28/2001

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: July 23, 2007

By: _____ / Pablo Tapia / _____

Pablo Tapia, Reg. No.: 52,275
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 707-0058
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

July 23, 2007
Date

/Rimma N. Oks/
Signature

Rimma N. Oks
Printed Name

Type of Response: Final Response
Application Number: 09/895,429
Attorney Docket Number: 163182.01
Filing Date: 6/28/2001